

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for the bottom line--and a handful of owners' political interests--and less of what we need for democracy to function effectively.

Is it right that a single company's decision should have the ability to sway 24% of the nation's voters? Does this not give too much power to a handful of individuals?

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.